

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
WESTERN DIVISION

LAURA IBITOYE,

Plaintiff,

**V.**

CREST CORE PROPERTY  
MANAGEMENT, LLC,

Defendant.

**No. 19-cv-2878**

## ORDER

Before the Court is the Magistrate Judge's Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion to Compel and Report and Recommendation on Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, dated April 17, 2020 (the "Report"). (ECF No. 14.) The Report recommends granting Defendant Crest Core Property Management LLC's Motion to Dismiss, (ECF No. 12). (ECF No. 14 at 2, 12.) The Report advised the parties that any objections must be filed within 14 days of service. (Id. at 12.) No objections have been filed.

Congress enacted 28 U.S.C. § 636 to relieve the burden on the federal judiciary by permitting the assignment of district-court duties to magistrate judges. See United States v. Curtis, 237 F.3d 598, 602 (6th Cir. 2001) (citing Gomez v. United States,

490 U.S. 858, 869-70 (1989)); see also Baker v. Peterson, 67 F. App'x 308, 310 (6th Cir. 2003). A district court has the authority to "designate a magistrate judge to conduct hearings, including evidentiary hearings, and to submit to a judge of the court proposed findings of fact and recommendations for the disposition, by a judge of the court, of any motion." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B).

The district court has appellate jurisdiction over any decisions the magistrate judge issues pursuant to a referral. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72. "The district judge must determine de novo any part of the magistrate judge's disposition that has been properly objected to." Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The district court is not required to review -- under a de novo or any other standard -- "any issue that is not the subject of an objection." Thomas v Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). The district court should adopt the findings and rulings of the Magistrate Judge to which no specific objection is filed. Id.; United States v. Walters, 638 F.2d 947, 950 (6th Cir. 1981).

Neither party has objected to the Report. The deadline to do so under Local Rule 72.1 has passed. See also 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The Court has reviewed the Report. Its recommendation is warranted. See Arn, 474 U.S. at 150-51.

The Report is ADOPTED. Defendant's Motion to Dismiss is GRANTED.

So ordered this 8th day of May, 2020.

/s/ Samuel H. Mays, Jr.  
SAMUEL H. MAYS, JR.  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE